

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST JOSEPH C. BALDASSARI FOR
CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

SEPTEMBER 18 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 13), 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. O'CONOR, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. Res. 213]

The Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, as created and authorized by the United States Senate by Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, second session, and as extended by Senate Resolution 129, Eighty-second Congress, first session, caused to be issued a subpoena to Joseph C. Baldassari, of Scranton, Pa. The said subpoena directed Joseph C. Baldassari to be and appear before the said committee on August 7, 1951, at 10 a. m., at room 318, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, to produce certain records and documents, and not to depart without leave of said committee. The date of issuance of the subpoena was the 31st day of July 1951. Attendance pursuant to said subpoena was duly had on August 7, 1951, at 10 a. m., at which time the witness appeared. The subpoena served upon said Joseph C. Baldassari is set forth as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

To JOSEPH BALDASSARI, *Scranton, Pa.*, *Greeting:*

Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to appear before the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the Senate of the United States, on August 7, 1951, at 10 a. m., at their committee room, room 318, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., then and there to testify what you may know relative to the subject matters under consideration by said committee. And bring with you copies of your income-tax returns for the years 1945 to 1950, inclusive; also bank accounts, canceled checks, bank statements, and records of all real and personal property held by you, directly or indirectly.

Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

To United States marshal, Scranton, Pa., to serve and return.

Given under my hand, by order of the committee, this 31st day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifty-one.

HERBERT R. O'CONOR,

Chairman, Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

The said subpoena was duly served as appears by the return made thereof by Leo Feigenbaum, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpoena. The return of the service by said Leo Feigenbaum, being endorsed thereon, is set forth as follows:

AUGUST 2, 1951.

I made service of the within subpoena by making personal service on the within-named Joseph Baldassari, at place of business 1330 Pittston Avenue, Scranton, Pa., at 10:20 a. m., on the 2d day of August 1951.

So answers:
Per

CARL H. FLECKENSTINE, *United States Marshal,*
LEO FEIGENBAUM, *Deputy.*

The said Joseph C. Baldassari, pursuant to said subpoena and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said committee to give such testimony as required by virtue of Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, second session, and Senate Resolution 129, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Joseph C. Baldassari having appeared as a witness and having been asked questions, which questions were pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, refused to disclose the contents of those records and documents which he had been directed by the subpoena to produce, and made answers as appeared in the record of the hearing held on August 7, 1951, in room 457, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., which record is annexed hereto and made a part hereof and designated "Annex I."

As a result of said Joseph C. Baldassari's refusal to disclose the contents of those records and documents which he had been directed by the subpoena to produce and to answer the questions pursuant to the said inquiry, as appears in the record annex, consisting of the testimony of that day, the committee was prevented from receiving testimony and evidence concerning the matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of said subpoena served upon the witness.

The committee was therefore deprived of answers to questions pursuant to the committee's inquiry propounded to Joseph C. Baldassari pertinent to the subject matter which under Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, second session, and Senate Resolution 129, Eighty-second Congress, first session, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to disclose the contents of those records and documents which he had been directed by the subpoena to produce and to answer said questions is a violation of the subpoena under which the witness was directed to appear and answer questions pertinent to the subject under inquiry and to produce certain records and documents, and his persistent and illegal refusal to disclose the contents of the aforesaid records and documents and to answer the aforesaid questions deprived the committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and evidence and places this witness in contempt of the United States Senate.

The subcommittee hearing at which said witness refused to disclose the contents of the aforesaid records and documents and to answer said questions was duly authorized by the following resolution of the said

committee, which was unanimously adopted by said committee on May 23, 1951:

Resolved, That the chairman of this committee be, and he hereby is, authorized to appoint, at his discretion, one or more subcommittees, consisting of one or more members of this committee, of whom one member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony, to hold hearings in furtherance of the committee's investigations of organized crime, at such times and at such places as the chairman shall designate in the vicinities of the cities of Lexington, Ky., Baltimore, Md., and Washington, D. C.

HERBERT R. O'CONOR, *Chairman*.
CHARLES W. TOBEY.
LESTER C. HUNT.
ESTES KEFAUVER.
ALEXANDER WILEY.

In accordance with the resolution of May 23, 1951, the chairman designated himself and Senators Lester C. Hunt and Alexander Wiley as a subcommittee of three to swear witnesses, and to hear testimony at Washington, D. C., on August 7, 1951. The said Joseph C. Baldassari appeared and testified before the said subcommittee at a public hearing which was held on August 7, 1951, in room 457, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

After reviewing the testimony and other facts as set forth herein, the committee at an executive session held on August 24, 1951, adopted a resolution authorizing presentation to the Senate of a Senate resolution requiring that proceedings for contempt be brought against the said Joseph C. Baldassari, as appears from the following excerpt from the minutes of the said meeting of August 24, 1951:

A meeting of the committee was held in the office of Senator Herbert R. O'Connor, room 248 of the United States Senate Office Building, on August 24, 1951, at 12:30 p. m.

Present were Senators O'Connor (chairman), Hunt, Kefauver, and Wiley. Also present was Richard G. Moser, chief counsel.

The chairman presented to the committee the resolution which was unanimously adopted by the committee on May 23, 1951, authorizing the chairman of the committee to appoint one or more subcommittees to hold hearings in the vicinities of the cities of Lexington, Ky., Baltimore, Md., and Washington, D. C.

The chairman stated to the committee that, pursuant to the said resolution of May 23, 1951, he had designated himself and Senators Lester C. Hunt and Alexander Wiley as a subcommittee of three to swear witnesses and to hear testimony in connection with organized crime at Washington, D. C., on August 7, 1951. The chairman then presented to the committee the report of the proceedings of the public hearing which was held by the subcommittee on August 7, 1951, in room 457, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. The chairman stated to the committee that the witnesses Patrick Joseph Size, Joseph C. Baldassari, and Joseph Scalleat, repeatedly, consistently, and arbitrarily had refused to answer questions put to them throughout the committee's examination of these witnesses on August 7, 1951, and that their refusal therefore was improper and contemptuous. The chairman also stated to the committee that on August 7, 1951, the witnesses Patrick Joseph Size and Joseph C. Baldassari repeatedly and arbitrarily had refused to disclose to the committee the contents of those records and documents which they had been directed by the subpoena to produce, and that the witness Joseph Scalleat had arbitrarily failed and refused to produce altogether those records and documents which he had been directed by the subpoena to produce, and that this refusal on the part of the witnesses was, therefore, improper and contemptuous. The chairman presented to the committee, for its consideration, draft reports on the entire matter, and the committee duly adopted the said reports and instructed the chairman to present them to the United States Senate.

After discussion, on motion duly made by Senator Kefauver and seconded by Senator Hunt, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

* * * * *

Resolved, That the committee present to the United States Senate, for its immediate action, a resolution requiring the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to proceed against the said Joseph C. Baldassari in the manner and form prescribed by law.

* * * * *

HERBERT R. O'CONOR, *Chairman*.
LESTER C. HUNT.
ESTES KEFAUVER.
ALEXANDER WILEY.

ANNEX I

INVESTIGATION OF ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., Tuesday, August 7, 1951.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:10 a. m., in room 457, Senate Office Building, Senator Herbert R. O'Connor (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators O'Connor (chairman) and Hunt.

Also present: Richard G. Moser, chief counsel; Rufus G. King, Jr., and Norman Poliski, assistant counsel; and George Martin, director of public information.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will please come to order.

At the outset I wish to announce that pursuant to a resolution of the full committee, the chairman is authorized to appoint a subcommittee to conduct this hearing and he has done so, designating the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. Hunt, the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Wiley, and the Senator from Maryland to constitute the subcommittee, with the usual provision that any one will constitute a quorum.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Joseph Baldassari. Will you raise your right hand. In the presence of Almighty God do you swear the testimony you give to be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH C. BALDASSARI, SCRANTON, PA., ACCOMPANIED BY
CHARLES E. FORD, COUNSEL

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state your full name.

Mr. BALDASSARI. Joseph C. Baldassari.

The CHAIRMAN. Joseph C. Baldassari. And it is spelled B-a-l-d-a-s-s-a-r-i?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And your address.

Mr. BALDASSARI. Cleveland Avenue, Scranton, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. Cleveland Avenue, Scranton, Pa. Could I ask you at the outset to be kind enough to talk into the mike. And you are represented by counsel here today, are you?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ford is your lawyer?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ford, you will be available to him for any comments you wish to make.

How long have you lived in Scranton?

Mr. BALDASSARI. All my life.

The CHAIRMAN. All your life. How long is that?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Thirty-eight years.

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-eight years. Are you married?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What family do you have?

Mr. BALDASSARI. No children.

The CHAIRMAN. Any brothers and sisters?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Three brothers.

The CHAIRMAN. What are their names?

- Mr. BALDASSARI. Elio, Elmo, and Henry.
The CHAIRMAN. A little slower.
Mr. BALDASSARI. Elio, Henry, and Elmo.
The CHAIRMAN. Where do they live?
Mr. BALDASSARI. Scranton.
The CHAIRMAN. All live in Scranton?
Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Polski, will you proceed.
Mr. POLSKI. What business are you in?
Mr. BALDASSARI. I refuse to answer on the ground that it may incriminate me.
Mr. POLSKI. You refuse to say what business you are in at the present time?
Mr. BALDASSARI. That is right.
Mr. POLSKI. Are you connected with the Baldassari Amusement Co.?
Mr. BALDASSARI. I refuse to answer that, it may incriminate me.
The CHAIRMAN. When you went to work what job did you first take? What work were you engaged in at first?
Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer on the ground that it may incriminate me.
The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever been engaged in any legitimate business?
Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that question on the ground that it may incriminate me.
The CHAIRMAN. From the time that you went to work years ago have you ever done anything lawful? Have you ever been engaged in anything legitimate and within the law?
Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer on the ground that it may incriminate me.
Mr. POLSKI. Mr. Baldassari, you were asked to produce certain records here. Do you have them with you today?
Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
Mr. POLSKI. May we see them, please?
Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to let you view my records on the ground that it may incriminate me.
The CHAIRMAN. What records have you got with you in response to the summons?
Mr. BALDASSARI. All the records that the summons recites.
The CHAIRMAN. And do you have all those records at the present time with you here?
Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
Mr. FORD. Would you want to disclose them in the record? They comprise two handbags full, a manila folder, and a ledger book.
The CHAIRMAN. And, Counsel, without opening the bag and just so we may have an idea of just what they contain, could you be a little more specific as to just what they contain?
Mr. FORD. They contain all records regarding his income tax returns for 1945 to 1950, bank accounts, canceled checks, bank statements, records of all real and personal property held by him, either directly or indirectly, and both these bags are quite full. This manila envelope is full, and this ledger sheet is—
Mr. MOSER. Those records describe all his business activities, do they?
Mr. FORD. Yes, sir.
Mr. MOSER. In other words, his business activities are sufficiently voluminous to require records filling two full suitcases, a manila envelope, and an account book, and he refuses to reveal the nature or contents on the ground it may incriminate him.
Mr. FORD. Plus real estate which may not be in the records, plus personal property.
The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ford, would you mind opening the bags and let us see the records? Will you put them on the table?
Mr. FORD. I can enumerate them from here.
The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you do.
Mr. FORD. This is a checkbook with all the stubs.
Mr. MOSER. For what period?
Mr. FORD. 1949—August 23, 1949, through October 1950. This is an envelope purporting to be full of social-security records.
The CHAIRMAN. Does it indicate the period?
Mr. FORD. This envelope includes all types of bills and headings, such as a roofing company, motor-machine company, a Cadillac automobile, service-station records, amusement-machine records, radio records, a marble-supply company, all records and purchases, repairing of all kinds. That, in general, is this envelope.

Mr. MOSER. Does it relate to the employees of those businesses? You said it was social-security records; is that correct?

Mr. FORD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSER. And it covers the employees?

Mr. FORD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSER. How many employees are involved?

Mr. FORD. Average between three and six, such as mechanics, repairmen.

Mr. MOSER. Three to six in each of those enterprises?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Pardon?

Mr. MOSER. Three to six in each of the enterprises?

Mr. FORD. These cover one enterprise.

Mr. MOSER. You mean all these records cover one enterprise?

Mr. FORD. Yes.

Mr. MOSER. Three to six employees?

Mr. FORD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How many different enterprises are represented by the records?

Mr. FORD. These that I have in this envelope would be one enterprise.

The CHAIRMAN. I meant the other records.

Mr. FORD. This is a large group of letters from the First National Bank of Scranton. Presumably, they include monthly statements and canceled checks.

Mr. MOSER. And what enterprises do they relate to?

Mr. FORD. The Baldassari Amusement Co.

Mr. MOSER. Baldassari Amusement Co.?

Mr. FORD. Yes.

Mr. MOSER. What period?

Mr. FORD. Well, this top one is February 5, 1943, March 1943, April 1948, May 1949, June 1948, July 1948, August 1948, September 1948, October 1948.

They also include a series of promissory notes, perhaps six in number, covering 1947 and 1948 calendar year. Other bank letters, November 1948, December 1948.

Mr. MOSER. What else is in that suitcase, Mr. Ford?

Mr. FORD. This large envelope which has written on the outside by red letters, "Payments made during 1948 by cash."

Mr. MOSER. Cash payments? What is in there?

Mr. FORD. A whole series of all types of bills.

Mr. MOSER. Receipted bills?

Mr. FORD. Yes; including printing bills, freight bills, invoices from the Pennsylvania Corp., statements from the national bank.

Mr. BALDASSARI. Notes.

Mr. FORD. Notes, they are. Coin machines, different parts of machines.

Mr. MOSER. Do these relate to the Baldassari Amusement Co.?

Mr. FORD. Many of these are listed to Joseph Baldassari himself.

Mr. POLSKI. What national bank is that?

Mr. FORD. Others to Baldassari Brothers. One to Joseph Baldassari as an individual.

Mr. POLSKI. You said the national bank. What national bank is that?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Northwestern.

Mr. POLSKI. Philadelphia?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes.

Mr. POLSKI. All your accounts are in Scranton, but some kept out of State?

Mr. FORD. Is that a question?

Mr. POLSKI. Yes.

Mr. BALDASSARI. I refuse to answer on the ground it may incriminate me.

The CHAIRMAN. Keep your voice up, please, and talk into the microphone.

Mr. FORD. Social security returns, such as this employer's report.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Ford, will you please explain to me why a tax return which has been filed with the Government cannot be produced on the grounds of incrimination? How can it incriminate the witness to produce a tax return which he has already filed with the Federal Government?

Mr. FORD. Because all returns by taxpayers contain memoranda and notes as to how they arrive at the results shown in the returns. Those forms filed with the Government do not always contain the detailed returns, but they contain the results.

Mr. MOSER. But they have already been filed. How can you claim he is going to be further incriminated?

Mr. FORD. The return is filed but with his copy the taxpayer keeps, he has additional information which he retains but which doesn't always go with his

return; so when the revenue agent comes to him and says, "On line 10 you have a certain figure; how do you arrive at it?" He picks out his working sheets. They are maintained by the taxpayer with his copy.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got the exact copies there of what has been filed with the Government so that there would be available to us either the carbons or the exact copies of returns filed?

Mr. FORD. Excepting that the Government does not have the returns of all taxpayers for certain years. They have been destroyed, particularly running from 1932 through 1938 and I believe either the year 1946, 1947, and 1948, the Government is not now in possession of all those returns of the taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. Are we to understand then that the witness elects and insists that he will not reveal certain tax returns because he is of the belief that the Government has destroyed the originals and he is in possession of the copies and they might incriminate him to produce?

Mr. FORD. That is correct, coupled with the statement the committee made to the witness, that inasmuch as the Government has the returns it would not harm him to produce them. I cite them as one of the exceptions where the Government does not have the returns of the taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. But my question is directed to the question of whether he refuses to produce them because he, by producing them, might incriminate himself.

Mr. FORD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And in those instances where the Government's records are destroyed and his records if produced would incriminate him—

Mr. FORD. Yes. Should I give you generally some more of these items?

Mr. MOSER. I think it would be a good idea.

Mr. FORD. These are, as you see, a group of canceled checks.

Mr. MOSER. Canceled checks covering what?

Mr. FORD. Covering his bank account.

Mr. MOSER. Personal?

Mr. FORD. They are both, listed—by personal I take it you mean individually.

Mr. MOSER. Yes.

Mr. FORD. The heading is "Or Joe Baldassari." However, we don't want to mislead the committee. He also as an individual trades under a business name such as an amusement company. So for the purposes of answering we would say yes, if you construe that he is an individual running the machine company, too, the amusement company.

Mr. MOSER. The amusement company being Baldassari Amusement Co.; is that correct?

Mr. FORD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BALDASSARI. Partnership.

Mr. MOSER. The witness says—

Mr. FORD. I have just been advised, so that the committee may not be misled, it may appear as a partnership.

Mr. MOSER. It may appear as a partnership?

Mr. FORD. Yes.

Mr. MOSER. Does that mean it may appear to be but it is not or it is in fact a partnership?

Mr. FORD. I will take that as a question from the committee to the witness.

Mr. MOSER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, Mr. Ford, we are interested to know, so we could understand, of course, the purport and the bearing of the different records as to whether or not the Baldassari Amusement Co. is in fact a partnership.

Mr. FORD. Our answer will be, "Yes"; a partnership.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a partnership?

Mr. FORD. Yes.

Mr. MOSER. May I ask the witness who the partners are?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I refuse to answer that on the ground that it may incriminate me.

Mr. FORD. These are likewise similar documents; for instance, these checks like the group I just gave you and additional sheets like sheets of these. Then in addition there are several other checkbooks with stubs and, in fact, this one has certain blank checks also still left in it, bank deposit slips, and what not.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ford, there is one comment that I might make, and which may have bearing upon the response of the witness and to which possibly you are entitled to know.

If I understood you correctly, you based the refusal of the witness to produce certain records on income taxes because of the fact that the records may be the only ones in existence, that is to say, the Federal Government, according to the witness's belief and understanding, has destroyed the originals and therefore if he were to produce the copies he would thereby produce records which might incriminate him because of the absence, as he believes, of any originals by the Government.

Mr. FORD. That is one of the reasons, but there are others.

The CHAIRMAN. If I could confine it just to that one for the sake of this discussion—

Mr. FORD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). The reason I am making the comment is I am advised by our staff member, Mr. George Martin, the director, and others, that actually in this particular case the Government has not destroyed its records.

Now that being so, assuming that to be the case—and I am basing it on what the official information is—I just make that observation in order to see whether or not in that situation the witness desires to change his position because the belief which he has is apparently a mistaken belief and the Federal Government does have the originals.

My question is whether or not, with that statement to him, he desires to persist in his refusal to produce them because the Federal Government does have the originals.

Mr. FORD. My answer to that, Senator, is that I controvert that the Government has not destroyed the records. From 1932 to 1938 by an act of Congress, the internal revenue records of taxpayers were destroyed.

I have quite a personal and intimate knowledge of that, and I have further information obtained yesterday in another tax case I am handling regarding other years. So I am sorry and I hate that it is necessary to controvert the statement of the investigators that you have.

However, be that as it may, whether the committee has them or not, the witness stands on his constitutional right because whatever records he has may be used as a basis for starting a net worth investigation of the witness, even though they go into other years.

For instance, this morning I believe some member of the committee stated that a return for 1950 was outside the statute of limitations. That is not my knowledge of the law. The return for 1950—

Mr. POLSKI. 1945, I believe.

Mr. FORD. 1945. The return for 1945 is not due until March, 1946. The 6-year statutory period, therefore, runs from March 1946 and it is still in effect as of this date.

The CHAIRMAN. Going back to the other point, are you familiar with the practice in the Twelfth District in Pennsylvania where the returns in this case might have been filed and might be on file?

Mr. FORD. No, sir; I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. The only reason I go back to that is it is our information—and Mr. Martin has actually seen some of the returns, I am not undertaking to say the exact specific years, but some dating back are actually in existence—and my point is whether or not, with that information imported to you, whether you do desire and the witness desires to change—

Mr. FORD. He does, and there is the additional reason that if he produces his returns and makes a disclosure of them, we believe that the committee would thereby be in a position to question him about that. So that if he opens up the subject, I understand the law to be that the witness, once waiving his privilege, must continue on and answer; but that he has to assert his privilege at its initial opening. So that if he does give you his returns, the committee could then start to question him about his returns, and he would be met, be faced with, "You yourself have opened it up by furnishing the returns. These questions we are about to ask you are on the same subject."

The CHAIRMAN. Do you contend that a witness may decline to answer any questions about his financial situation 20 years ago, for example, even though according to your own statement a minute ago the statute of limitations would only cover 6 years?

Mr. FORD. Yes, sir, because if they use that as the basis and have information of 20 years ago, they can net worth him of that year and then net worth him of 1951, and when they find an unreported increase in his income, the Government can allocate it to the live years—1950, 1949, 1948, and 1947—and if the informa-

tion gained 20 years ago, that permits a basic start for the net worth statement, yes, sir, I have seen that done.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is forced to disagree with you on some of those, respectfully.

Mr. FORD. I could respectfully suggest the names of some agents that are doing it.

Mr. MOSER. I see you have a larger suitcase belonging to the witness. What is in that?

Mr. FORD. These bills, the notation is "Baldassari, paid by check, 1950."

This is another stub checkbook with the stubs and notations on it. This goes back to 1944 and goes into 1945, both years covered by him.

This is a journal which contains disbursements in 1945 regarding certain people and individuals.

These are records of 1947 regarding the Baldassari Amusement Co.

I don't know what is in here, but his accountant sealed it. Do you care to have it disclosed?

Mr. MOSER. Let's see what is in it.

Mr. FORD. There are what appear to be monthly bank statements with canceled checks included.

Mr. MOSER. Those relate to Baldassari Amusement Co., do they?

Mr. FORD. Baldassari Amusement Co., and on this one there is an additional one. I assume it is his wife, Mrs. Viola Baldassari.

Mr. BALDASSARI. That isn't my wife. My brother's wife.

Mr. FORD. His brother's wife.

The CHAIRMAN. His sister-in-law. What is the name of the wife of the witness?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Olive.

The CHAIRMAN. Olive Baldassari is his wife and Viola is his sister-in-law.

May I ask Mr. Ford whether the other records that you have there all relate to the one, either to him individually or to the amusement company's operation?

Mr. FORD. Or he jointly with his brother's wife, his sister-in-law.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ford, I think that will suffice on that for the time being.

Mr. POLSKI. Mr. Baldassari, have you ever been arrested?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground that it may incriminate me.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you keep your voice up, please, so we may hear you without difficulty.

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. That is a matter of record, Mr. Baldassari. Anybody can look that up.

Mr. BALDASSARI. That would involve my identity.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you question the identity of the individual whose arrest is being inquired about?

Mr. BALDASSARI. That would involve my identity and place me at a certain place at a certain time.

Mr. MOSER. Are you trying to conceal from this committee your identity, Mr. Baldassari? I should think it would be very simple to admit who you are.

Mr. FORD. May he answer your question?

Mr. MOSER. I wish he would. May I interrupt? We have no objection to your advising your client what to say, as long as you are giving him advice, but if all you are doing is giving him the answer so that he answers it like a puppet, that is contrary to the proceedings of this committee.

Every question that we have asked him you make the answer for him. We have no objection to his consulting you and getting advice, but we do object to your furnishing him with the answer that he gives.

Mr. FORD. May I say—

Mr. MOSER. Answer the question as to whether Mr. Baldassari desires to conceal his identity from this committee.

Mr. FORD. May I advise him?

Mr. MOSER. You may.

Mr. BALDASSARI. No, I am merely standing on my constitutional rights.

Mr. MOSER. Your constitutional right. You mean you refuse to answer whether you have been arrested on the ground that it may incriminate you?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.

Mr. POLSKI. Did you state before, Mr. Baldassari, that you lived in Scranton all your life?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.

Mr. POLSKI. Have you ever been arrested in Scranton?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I assert my right.

Mr. POLSKI. What right are you asserting there, sir? You stated you lived there all your life.

Mr. BALDASSARI. On the ground that it tends to incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. Were you arrested on May 23, 1935, in Scranton?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer.

Mr. POLSKI. Was that for a revenue case, internal revenue?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer on the ground it may incriminate me.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Counsel, rather than to repeat after each question, I would like to have it understood that for the reason he is giving those same reasons they will apply to each of his refusals, and that the committee directs that he answer each and every one of the questions, and are we to understand that he persists in his refusals for those reasons?

Mr. FORD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, without his stating them each time, we will consider that the reasons he has given once will apply to all.

Mr. POLSKI. In connection with that 1935 arrest, you were given a 3-year sentence suspended; is that correct?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. Have you ever been in jail?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. Isn't it a matter of fact that on March 24, 1939, you were arrested for having in your possession an unregistered still and you were given a sentence of a year and a day in Lewisburg Prison?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer on the ground that it may incriminate me.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Baldassari, how can it incriminate you with respect to a crime for which you have been convicted and have served time? That can't incriminate you. You can't be tried again for that.

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. MOSER. Your are claiming the privilege on the ground of the Constitution. Doesn't the Constitution also say you may not be tried twice for the same crime?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that, too, on the ground that that may incriminate me.

Mr. MOSER. Are you in fear of being prosecuted a second time for the same crime?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that.

Mr. POLSKI. Mr. Baldassari, are you familiar with the address 108 Adams Avenue in Scranton? Do you know where that is?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I believe I do.

Mr. POLSKI. You do know where it is. Do you know what is located at that address?

Mr. FORD. I am not sure we heard the question.

Mr. BALDASSARI. Say it again, please.

Mr. POLSKI. Do you know what is located at the address 108 Adams Avenue in Scranton?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. Isn't it a fact that you and your brother have a bookie service operating out of that establishment?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. What is the offense of which you are afraid? Federal or State offense?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Federal.

Mr. POLSKI. Particularly which one?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Income tax.

Mr. POLSKI. Did the offense occur more than 10 years ago?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground that it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. How about 5 years ago?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer.

Mr. POLSKI. A year ago?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline.

Mr. POLSKI. Do you know a Mr. Pete Genello?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. How would that incriminate you, sir, knowing Mr. Genello?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer that on the ground that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. Do you know Jimmie Fogley?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer on the ground that it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. Do you know where Mr. Jimmie Fogley is?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer.

Mr. POLSKI. Is your brother Al in the bookie business at that establishment?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. Isn't it a fact that Mr. Fogley ran out on you owing you something like \$1,700?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

The CHAIRMAN. Previously you gave your age; did you not?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was that?

Mr. BALDASSARI. 38.

The CHAIRMAN. 38. When did you first go to work? Were you 18, 16, or 20, or what?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I would say, as far as I can remember, about 16.

The CHAIRMAN. About 16. So, you went to work about 22 years ago. Now, my question is whether in the 22 years you have ever been engaged in a legitimate work.

Mr. BALDASSARI. I believe the first job I had was loading coal in the mines.

The CHAIRMAN. Loading coal in the mines. How long did you work at that?

Mr. BALDASSARI. About 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. About 2 years. So then up until 20 years ago you were then 18, if my calculations are correct. Now, in the past 20 years have you ever been engaged in a legitimate work?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground that that may incriminate me.

The CHAIRMAN. So, you refuse to answer any question concerning your activities in 20 years, so far as work is concerned; is that correct?

Mr. BALDASSARI. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And my question, I just want to repeat it and make it very clear to you that we are asking you about your engagement in a legitimate or a lawful business, if any, in the past 20 years.

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline.

Mr. POLSKI. Do you know Mr. Anthony Petriello?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. Do you know Mr. Fogley operated a haberdashery store in Seranton?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. You don't know if he had a haberdashery store or not?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer.

Mr. POLSKI. I believe counsel mentioned before Mr. Baldassari has a Cadillac automobile; is that correct?

Mr. FORD. I said one of those bills was headed from a Cadillac automobile account, just identifying the document.

Mr. POLSKI. Do you have an automobile, Mr. Baldassari?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground that it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. You won't say whether you own an automobile?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Baldassari, how can you decline to answer whether you own an automobile? Practically everybody in the United States owns one. How can that incriminate you?

Mr. BALDASSARI. It may incriminate me in taxes.

Mr. MOSER. Just owning an automobile?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Baldassari, it seems to me that is highly contemptuous of this committee to refuse to answer the simple question of whether you own an automobile. How can you stand on that?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I stand on it.

Mr. POLSKI. Who is Ulysses Baldassari?

Mr. BALDASSARI. My father.

Mr. POLSKI. Your father. Was he a bondsman?

Mr. BALDASSARI. He was never in the bond business.

Mr. POLSKI. Never connected with a bonding business at all?

Mr. BALDASSARI. No, sir.

Mr. POLSKI. You are sure of that?

- Mr. BALDASSARI. Positive.
- Mr. POLSKI. Do you know Mr. Lou Cohen?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. Have you ever heard the name Lou Cohen?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that; it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. You decline to say whether you have heard the name or seen it in the newspapers anywhere?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I have heard it here today, and I have read about it.
- The CHAIRMAN. Is that the first time?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. You say you have seen it in the newspapers; is that correct?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. POLSKI. In what connection? What did you see in the newspapers?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. That they were looking for him to be subpoenaed.
- Mr. POLSKI. Before this committee?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. That is right.
- Mr. POLSKI. Have you ever seen his name in the Scranton papers before this?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I don't remember.
- Mr. POLSKI. Have you ever heard his name mentioned in talk around Scranton?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. How would that incriminate you, sir? You could hear that from anybody. You could hear his name mentioned.
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that, sir. It may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. Mr. Baldassari, did you ever own a horse?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. You decline to say whether you ever owned a horse?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. POLSKI. Did you ever own an airplane?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. Do you know a Mr. Harold Siegert?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. Isn't it a fact he was a pilot for that airplane and that at various times you took members of the Scranton police force on trips?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. MOSER. Mr. Baldassari, how can the taking of a policeman in an airplane tend to incriminate you under a Federal statute?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer.
- Mr. MOSER. You decline to answer on the ground that it may incriminate you?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. That is right.
- Mr. MOSER. You claim that it would incriminate you to tell us whether you took a policeman in an airplane; is that correct?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. MOSER. And is that because it would incriminate you under a Federal statute?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. MOSER. And what statute could be violated by way of taking—what Federal statute could be violated by taking a policeman in an airplane?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. My expenditures that would be involved on my income tax.
- Mr. MOSER. Expenditures in the operation of the airplane?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer on the ground that that may incriminate me.
- Mr. MOSER. Do you refuse to answer that question on the ground that the expenditures might have consisted of bribes paid to the policeman you took in the airplane?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. Mr. Baldassari, have you ever heard of the Royal Hotel on Linden Street?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. POLSKI. Have you ever been in there?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. A few times.
- Mr. POLSKI. How often? You say "a few." What do you mean by "a few"?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I just can't remember how many times. I don't keep track.
- Mr. POLSKI. Have you been in there 10 times this year?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I have machines in there. I don't know just how many times.
- Mr. POLSKI. You have machines in there?

- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. POLSKI. Machines from where?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. You have machines. What kind of machines are they?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Jukeboxes.
- Mr. POLSKI. Jukebox machines in there?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. POLSKI. How many?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. One.
- Mr. POLSKI. Just one. When did you put that in there?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I couldn't remember just what day. I would have to look at my books.
- Mr. MOSER. You said a few moments ago you have machines in there. Now you say you have one jukebox. What other machines do you have in there?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. The other machine is one of them shuffle alleys you play with money. You put a dime in and play.
- Mr. MOSER. Do you have slot machines in there?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. MOSER. How can it incriminate you under a Federal offense with regard to slot machines when it doesn't incriminate you with regard to a pinball or jukebox or shuffle machine? Isn't the difference that one is a violation of the State law and the other is not?
- Mr. FORD. The witness would like to reconsider the committee's question as to whether or not he has any slot machines in that place. Does he have the committee's permission to do that?
- The CHAIRMAN. Yes.
- Mr. BALDASSARI. No, sir.
- Mr. POLSKI. You say "No, sir"?
- Mr. FORD. That he does not have a slot machine.
- Mr. POLSKI. Do you own any slot machines?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Refuse to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. Do you have any financial interest in the Royal Hotel?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. Is that listed on your income tax?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. Have you ever had anything to drink in the Royal Hotel?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. When I go in there once in a while and collect the machines, I buy a drink.
- Mr. POLSKI. Once in a while you do buy a drink?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. POLSKI. What is the bartender's name?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Well, they have a couple there.
- Mr. POLSKI. Tell me their names.
- Mr. BALDASSARI. All I know is the first name of one of them.
- Mr. POLSKI. What is that?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Tony.
- Mr. POLSKI. Who?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Tony.
- Mr. POLSKI. Tony?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. POLSKI. Do you know a Mr. Siegert? Was he ever a bartender there?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. Isn't that the same Siegert that was a pilot for that airplane of yours?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer.
- Mr. POLSKI. Have you ever heard of the name Jack Gagliano, alias Ross?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground that it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. You decline to say if you have even heard of the man's name?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I have heard his name.
- Mr. POLSKI. You have heard his name?
- The CHAIRMAN. The man we are referring to is the one that was released from the Eastern Penitentiary a few months ago. You know who we mean?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. POLSKI. Where did you hear his name mentioned, can you recall?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. In around Scranton.
- Mr. POLSKI. Where particularly around Scranton?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I don't remember exactly where.

Mr. POLSKI. Do you recall who told you the name, whether you saw the name in the newspapers or heard it on the radio?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I remember reading about him in the newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever have any dealings with him?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. Did you ever use this man for strong-arm purposes in an attempt to get the \$1,700 back that Fogley took from you?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. How would that incriminate you, sir?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that. That may incriminate me.

Mr. MOSER. I think your counsel would advise you you have to state the ground on which you claim the incrimination.

Mr. FORD. I agree with counsel, he has to state the ground of incrimination, but when he is asked the question, how does it incriminate him, I submit the case if you give that reason, you might as well answer the question to begin with.

I submit how it would incriminate him he does not have to state.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a distinction between stating the nature of the grounds on which he relies and then of giving the detailed information which may, of course, disclose the very thing that he is desirous of withholding. Do you make that distinction?

Mr. FORD. Yes; I do.

Mr. POLSKI. Mr. Baldassari, have you ever heard of the Glass Hat? In Scranton?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.

Mr. POLSKI. You have. Have you ever been in that establishment?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I have been in there several times having drinks.

Mr. POLSKI. Is that place operating today?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes; I believe so.

Mr. POLSKI. You believe it is. Do you own any interest in it?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. Did you ever have an interest in it?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Decline to answer.

Mr. POLSKI. Have you ever paid protection for anything in Scranton?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, Mr. Baldassari, so we understand the question is as to whether—I want you to consider it carefully now—as to whether you have bribed or given any protection money or in any other manner improperly influenced any law officer or any official in the State of Pennsylvania.

Now are we to understand that you decline to answer that on the ground that you may by answering it incriminate yourself?

Mr. BALDASSARI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, we are free to draw our own inferences from your refusal. Counsel.

Mr. FORD. Senator, I think our court of appeals in the last year in the Belicci case had that proposition before them. Any inferences that may be drawn from it, they held in that case, Judge Prettyman unanimously for the court, that no inference either way could be drawn from it.

The CHAIRMAN. I meant we may very well be interested in following out further leads we have. That is what I meant.

Mr. FORD. I misunderstood you.

Mr. POLSKI. Do you know Captain Beynan?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes; I do.

Mr. POLSKI. You do know him?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.

Mr. POLSKI. What position does he hold in the police force of Scranton?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I believe he is captain of police.

Mr. POLSKI. How long have you known him?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Since I am a little boy.

Mr. POLSKI. Are you very friendly with him?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Well, I wouldn't say real friendly. I know him.

Mr. POLSKI. Even been out with him?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. You say you just know him casually; is that correct? You refuse to say whether you have ever been out with him?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Right.

- Mr. POLSKI. How about Lieutenant Smallacombe?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Who?
- Mr. POLSKI. Smallacombe.
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I know him.
- Mr. POLSKI. How long have you known him?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. About 10 years or so. I just can't remember how long.
- Mr. POLSKI. How well do you know him?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. You decline to state how well you know him?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. That is right.
- Mr. POLSKI. Do you know the director of public safety, Mr. Lonsdorf?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I know him.
- Mr. POLSKI. How long have you known him?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. A few years.
- Mr. POLSKI. Five years?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. About that, not more than 5 years.
- Mr. POLSKI. How well do you know him?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Just casually.
- Mr. POLSKI. On friendly terms with him?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I wouldn't say so.
- Mr. POLSKI. You don't think so. Do you know anything about a \$2,500 ring that you presented him?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. POLSKI. You decline to say if you gave him a \$2,500 diamond ring?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that.
- Mr. POLSKI. How would that incriminate you, sir?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that, sir.
- Mr. POLSKI. You decline to say how it would incriminate you?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. That is right.
- Mr. POLSKI. I have no further questions.
- The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Moser has one further question.
- Mr. MOSER. While your counsel was showing you those records, it was stated by you to him, and I think also to us, that some of the bank statements covered your individual account not only as an individual but also in the name of the business which you operate, namely, Baldassari Amusement Co.; is that correct?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes; that is right.
- Mr. MOSER. So that the accounts covered you as an individual operating the Baldassari Amusement Co.; is that correct?
- Mr. FORD. The witness says that he further had disclosed that it was a partnership as distinguished from an individual. Individually, yes; as an individual member of a partnership.
- Mr. MOSER. As an individual member of a partnership?
- Mr. FORD. Yes, sir.
- Mr. MOSER. Then he refused to disclose who the other partners were.
- Mr. FORD. Yes.
- Mr. MOSER. Isn't it true, Mr. Baldassari, that the partners in that organization consist of your wife and your sister-in-law, your wife and your brother's wife?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes.
- Mr. MOSER. The partners, then, are Olive Baldassari and Viola Baldassari; is that correct?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. It is a four-way partnership. My brother and his wife and me and my wife. It has been that way ever since—in the last 6 or 7 years.
- Mr. MOSER. So that there are four partners consisting of you and your brother and—you withdraw your objection to revealing the names of the partners of that partnership?
- Mr. FORD. In view of the way the question was put.
- Mr. MOSER. Isn't it true that the tax returns filed by Baldassari Amusement Co. show that you and your brother are not partners but that your respective wives are partners?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.
- Mr. MOSER. But nevertheless it is true that you and your brother are members of the partnership; is that correct, as you stated before?
- Mr. BALDASSARI. I stand on my previous answer.
- Mr. MOSER. But you refuse to state whether your tax returns show that you and your brother are not partners?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer.

Mr. MOSER. We have examined the tax return for 1950 of Baldassari Amusement Co. and it does not reveal the fact that you and your brother are members of the partnership, but shows your respective wives as a partner. Is that a correct statement in the tax return?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. MOSER. That is all I have to ask.

Mr. POLSKI. Have you ever heard of the Mafia?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Just what I read in the paper, that is all.

Mr. POLSKI. What do you read in the paper about it?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I don't know. I never followed it up. I seen the word "Mafia," some kind of gang, that is all.

Mr. POLSKI. Have you ever had any experiences with the Mafia concerning your family?

Mr. BALDASSARI. No.

Mr. POLSKI. Is any member of your family a member of the Mafia?

Mr. BALDASSARI. No, sir.

Mr. POLSKI. Any member of your family have any experience with the Mafia?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Not that I would know.

Mr. POLSKI. Threats of any kind?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I don't think so.

Mr. POLSKI. You are sure?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Pretty sure.

Mr. POLSKI. How about your brother, Al?

Mr. BALDASSARI. As far as I know.

Mr. POLSKI. You are certain of that?

Mr. BALDASSARI. As far as I know. I could stake my life on it.

Mr. MOSER. Isn't it true you own a race horse?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. MOSER. Isn't it true that you own an airplane and that you have used the airplane to take members of the police department on trips?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline. I stand on that answer.

Mr. MOSER. Isn't it also true you gave a bribe to a police officer consisting of a ring worth \$2,500?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. How long have you lived at your present address?

Mr. BALDASSARI. June 1, 1950.

Mr. POLSKI. That is a new house?

Mr. BALDASSARI. Yes, sir.

Mr. POLSKI. How much did it cost you?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer that on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. POLSKI. Isn't it a fact it cost in excess of \$30,000?

Mr. BALDASSARI. I decline to answer.

Mr. FORD. Senator, I notice that as to a previous witness after he left, you advised him he is still under subpoena. Would you want to advise this witness?

The CHAIRMAN. We feel we have concluded the examination of this witness. He is still under subpoena, but we don't require him to remain in the room.